

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 30-38, and 43-45. By this paper, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-6, 30-38, and 43-45 and added new claims 46-63. These amendments do not add any new matter. Upon entry of these amendments, claims 46-63 are pending in the present application and are believed to be in condition for allowance. In view of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of all pending claims.

New Claims

Applicants respectfully assert that neither of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest, alone or together, the features recited in new claims 46-63. The present application relates to integrating Java-based dialogs with native dialogs in an application program and, more particularly, to resolving inadequacies of a native interface. Page 2, lines 1-2. Accordingly, new independent claim 46 recites “*converting the message* to a message addressed to the java window” and “*delivering the converted message* to the java window.” (Emphasis added.) New independent claim 53 recites a message dispatcher configured “to identify whether a particular message is intended for a java window or a non-java window” and “*to deliver* the message to a non-java message handler *if the message is intended for a non-java window.*” (Emphasis added.) New independent claim 58 recites “code adapted to convert the message to a message addressed to the java window” and “code adapted to deliver the converted message to the java window.” (Emphasis added.) New independent claim 60 recites “a messaging system, wherein one of the non-java computer programs is configured to transmit messages to the messaging system and *wherein the messaging system is configured to identify whether the transmitted message is for a non-java program or a java program...*

wherein the messaging system is configured *to deliver the transmitted message to the java virtual machine* if the message is for a java program.” (Emphasis added.)

In sharp contrast, the Borgendale reference describes a system for allowing application programs that are written for different graphical interfaces to be executed on a single desktop. *See Borgendale et al., col. 3, lines 12-18.* The Borgendale reference discloses that different graphical user interfaces (“GUIs”) present compatibility issues, because each GUI has its own application programming interface and functions that are limited to an operating system. *See Borgendale et al., col. 2, lines 17-30.* An asserted advantage of the system disclosed in the Borgendale reference is that a single graphical user interface and operating system are used to execute application programs that are written for different types of GUIs. *See Borgendale et al., col. 4, lines 6-21.* In other words, the Borgendale reference discloses a system that translates graphics from one format to another. The Borgendale reference is concerned with translation of graphic and not with the addressing or routing of messages between windows or programs; there is no mention in the Borgendale reference of the above-recited claim features of new independent claims 46, 53, 58, or 60.

The Java 2 Platform reference cannot cure this deficiency in the Borgendale reference, as the Java 2 Platform reference is merely a specification that relates to Java 2 platform APIs. The Java 2 Platform reference merely discloses the existence of various JAVA commands and other information relating to the APIs. Accordingly, the Java 2 Platform reference also does not appear to disclose or teach the above-recited claim features of new independent claims 46, 53, 58, or 60. For at least these reasons,

Appellants respectfully assert that the new claims 46, 53, 58, or 60, as well as the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable over the references cited in the most recent Office Action.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner wishes to resolve any other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 2, 2005



David M. Hoffman
Reg. No., 54,174
(281) 970-4545

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400